

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration of this application. The Office Action dated October 23, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Claims 1 and 3-14 are currently pending in this application. Claim 2 remains cancelled. Applicant amends claims 3 and 11 to correct typographical errors. Based on the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

II. EXAMINER INTERVIEW

In response to the Interview Summary for the interview conducted Wednesday, January 13, 2010, Applicants submit the following Statement of the Substance of the Interview.

Participants: (1) Primary Examiner Bradley King; (2) Examiner James K. Hsiao; and (3) Applicants' Representative Justine A. Gozzi

Date of Interview: January 13, 2010

Type: Personal Interview

1) Brief Description of the Nature of any Exhibit Shown or any Demonstration Conducted: None.

2) Claims Discussed: 1

3) Specific Prior Art Discussed: U.S. Patent No. 5,967,286 to Hokanson et al and E.P. Patent No. 1,227,267 to Morone

4) Identification of Principal Proposed Amendments: None

5) Brief Identification of Principal Arguments Presented: Ms. Gozzi articulated distinctions between claim 1 and the references of record. Ms. Gozzi and the Examiner reached an agreement regarding the patentability of claim 1.

6) Other Pertinent Matters: None.

7) Results: An agreement was reached regarding the patentability of claim 1 over the prior art of record.

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)

On page 2, the Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,967,286 to Hokanson et al in view of E.P. Patent No. 1,227,267 to Morone. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 3-14 depend from independent claim 1 and overcome the §103(a) rejection for at least the same reasons.

A. CLAIM 1

The Action provides that Hokanson teaches all of the claimed elements except for the material of the cams and the Action looks to Marone to remedy said deficiencies. For the reasons discussed in the Examiner Interview of January 13, 2010, Applicant respectfully traverses and respectfully submits that the combination of Hokanson and Marone fails to render the claimed invention for a plurality of reasons.

As previously discussed in the Examiner Interview, the combination of Hokanson and Marone at least fails to disclose "said first cam is defined by a **single tubular body** made of plastic material **co-moulded on said supporting shaft**" (Emphasis Added).

Hokanson discloses an adjustment mechanism that has an adjustor ring 82 for use with a driven clutch of a continuously variable transmission (See Hokanson Abstract). The Hokanson follower plate 60 receives a leg 80 of the torsional spring 74 in the recess 64 of the follower plate. The plate includes a roller drive 68 which cooperates with the cam track 70 to facilitate torsional adjustment of the assembly by rotating the follower plate 60 containing the spring leg 80 (See Hokanson, Col.4, lines 19-27).

The Office Action aligns the claimed "fixed half-pulley" with the Hokanson fixed pulley 42, the claimed "supporting shaft" with the Hokanson driven shaft 46, and the claimed "first cam" with the Hokanson cam track 70. The Hokanson cam track 70, however, is not "defined by a **single tubular body** made of plastic material **co-moulded on said supporting shaft**," as recited in claim 1 (Emphasis Added). Applicant respectfully submits Hokanson at least fails to teach the claimed elements discussed above.

Marone fails to remedy the deficiencies of Hokanson. Marone discloses an invention which improves the wear resistance of parts of a pulley (See Marone paragraph [0006]). More specifically, Marone seeks to improve the wear resistance of the cam 208 using a plastic material 210 to mold branches 212 and 211 together (See Marone paragraphs [0036] and [0037] and Fig. 3). The cam of Marone however is not "defined by a **single tubular body** made of plastic material **co-moulded on said supporting shaft**," as recited by claim 1.

Neither Hokanson nor Marone disclose or render obvious at least said feature of claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing remarks.

B. CLAIMS 3- 14

Claims 3- 14 depend from independent claim 1 and overcome the §103(a) rejection for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing remarks.

IV. CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will

expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: January 22, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Robert Kinberg/
Robert Kinberg
Registration No.: 26,924
Justine A. Gozzi
Registration No.: 60,513
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

RK:JAG/elw

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\1085427\1